

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,255	07/09/2003	Gerhard Spekowius	PHD 98164A	8008
24737 7	. 12/12/2006	EXAMINER		
	ELLECTUAL PROI	CHOW, DOON Y		
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			2629	
			DATE MAILED: 12/12/2000	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/616,255	SPEKOWIUS ET AL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dennis-Doon Chow	2629				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 36(a). In no event, however, may a repvill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ly be timely filed AS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 O	ctober 2006					
·						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•	· •	•			
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) 12-16 and 19 is/are pending in the ap	plication.	•				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		·				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12-16 and 19</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		•			
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	, , ,	, ,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 7	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Ap	plication No				
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been re	eceived in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not re	eceived.				
	•	•				
Attachment(s)	🗖					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)						
) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/616,255 Page 2

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 12-16 and 19 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6618056. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claimed invention is a broader version of the patented claimed invention. The following is an example for comparing claim 1 of the present claims and claim 1 of the patent claims.

Claim 12 of the present claims	Claim 1 of the patented claims
A display device for correcting a brightness distribution of gray tone images displayed by a monitor driven by a plurality	A display device for correcting a brightness distribution of gray tone images displayed by a monitor driven by a

Application/Control Number: 10/616,255

Art Unit: 2629

of electron rays, said display device comprising: a correction unit operable to generate a plurality of output digital image signals in response to a reception of an input digital image signal representative of a set of gray tone values, each output digital image signal representative of a set of correction gray tone values corresponding to the set of gray tone values of the input digital image signal, the correction gray tone values collectively being representative of a correction of a brightness distribution of the gray tone values; and a digital-lo-analog conversion unit operable to convert the output digital image signal: into a plurality of output analog image signals, said digital-toanalog conversion unit further operable to provide each output digital image signal to one of the electron rays whereby the brightness distribution of the gray tone images displayed by the monitor is corrected.

plurality of electron rays, said display device comprising: a correction unit operable to generate a plurality of output digital image signals in response to a reception of an input digital image signal representative of a set of gray tone values, each output digital image signal representative of a set of correction gray tone values corresponding to the set of gray tone values of the input digital image signal, the correction gray tone values collectively being representative of a correction of a brightness distribution of the gray tone values; and a digital-toanalog conversion unit operable to convert the output digital image signals into a plurality of output analog image signals, said digital-to-analog conversion unit further operable to provide each output digital image signal to one of the electron rays whereby the brightness distribution of the gray tone images displayed by the monitor is corrected; and a photosensor operable to measure an ambient light surrounding the monitor and to communicate the measured ambient light to said correction unit.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 12-16 and 19 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/3/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the arguments, applicant states that a terminal disclaimer is submitted. However, no record of such terminal disclaimed is found in the application. A telephone call was make to Mr. David Barnes on December 4, 2006 to request a resubmission of the terminal disclaimer, but no result was made. The double patenting rejection stands until a terminal disclaimer is submitted.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis-Doon Chow whose telephone number is 571-272-7767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 5

Dennis-Doon Chow Primary Examiner Art Unit 2629

D. Chow December 8, 2006